



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,889	12/10/1999	GERMANO CARONNI	6502.0283	8181

22852 7590 02/09/2004

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
1300 I STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

MOLINARI, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2665

23

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/457,889

Applicant(s)

CARONNI ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J Molinari

Art Unit

2665

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>21</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 11, 14-15, 17-18, 20, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency") in view of Short et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892).
3. Referring to claim 1, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a distributed system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, the method comprising the steps of: accessing an address of the destination node by the source node (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20. See also Figure 2 on page 214 and note that the source node could reside not only on Net-D as shown, but could reside on Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A); sending a first packet by the source node to the destination node by using the accessed address (see page 213, column 1, lines 20-22); receiving the first packet by the destination node at the accessed address of the destination node (see Section 4.2 on pages 213 and 214. Note that Host-X originally receives packets at its original location in Net-A where its PN-address equals its VN-address); updating the accessed address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to a new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35) wherein the updating includes sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source

Art Unit: 2665

node (Connection Notification packet, see page 214, column 1, line 3), and storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (note that the source node could be located on any of the networks Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A as shown in Figure 1 on page 214, and it would receive the update packet and update its address table); sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the stored new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and receiving the second packet by the destination node at the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and destination node are software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

4. Referring to claim 2, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node have a local address cache, and wherein the receiving the first packet step includes the step of: storing, in the local cache of the destination node, an address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 24-25, note that in receiving the query and then using the address received to respond, the receiving node would either already have the sending node's address in its address table or would add the address in the received packet to its address table); and wherein the updating step

Art Unit: 2665

further includes the steps of: retrieving from the local cache of the destination node the address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 33-35, noting that outgoing packets are addressed based on what is stored in the routing table of the router); and storing, in the local cache of the source node, the new address of the destination node (see page 213, lines 33-35).

5. Referring to claim 4, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate with other nodes by using a multicast address (in IP networks all subnets have a multicast address. In the event that two hosts start out on the same subnet, they would be able to communicate with each other by using a mutlicast address) such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to the source node, the destination node, and the other nodes, the source node and the other nodes having a local cache, wherein the updating step further includes the steps of: sending the update packet containing the new address of the destination node to the source node by the destination node using the multicast address; receiving the update packet by the source node and the other nodes; and storing in the local cache of the source node and the other nodes the new address of the destination node (see page 214, lines 2-10).

6. Referring to claim 7, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

7. Referring to claim 8, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a distributed system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein the source node and the destination node have an address, the method comprising the steps of: receiving the first packet by the destination node, at an address of the destination node, from the source node, the packet being addressed to the address of the destination node (see Section 4.2 on pages 213 and

Art Unit: 2665

214. Note that Host-X originally receives packets at its original location in Net-A where its PN-address equals its VN-address); updating the address of the destination node to a new address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36) wherein the updating includes sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node (Connection Notification packet, see page 214, column 1, line 3), and storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (note that the source node could be located on any of the networks Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A as shown in Figure 1 on page 214, and it would receive the update packet and update its address table); and receiving a second packet by the destination node at the new address (see page 213, lines 33-35). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 8 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

8. Referring to claim 9, Teraoka et al. disclose that the destination node has a local address cache, and wherein the receiving first packet step includes the step of: storing, in the local cache of the destination node, an address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 24-25, note that in

Art Unit: 2665

receiving the query and then using the address received to respond, the receiving node would either already have the sending node's address in its address table or would add the address in the received packet to its address table); and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: retrieving from the local cache of the destination node the address of the sending node (see page 213, lines 33-35, noting that outgoing packets are addressed based on what is stored in the routing table of the router).

9. Referring to claim 11, Teraoka et al. disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate with other nodes by using a multicast address (in IP networks all subnets have a multicast address. In the event that two hosts start out on the same subnet, they would be able to communicate with each other by using a multicast address) such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to the source node, the destination node, and the other nodes, the source node and the other nodes having a local cache, and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: sending the update packet containing the new address of the destination node to the source node by the destination node using the multicast address (see page 214, lines 2-10).

10. Referring to claim 14, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

11. Referring to claim 15, Teraoka et al. disclose a method in a data processing system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein each node has an address, the method comprising the steps of: sending a first packet from the source node (see Figure 2 on page 214 and note that the source node could be located not only on Net-D as shown,

Art Unit: 2665

but could be located on Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A) to the destination node by using the address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20); receiving an update packet containing a new address by the source node to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and Figure 2, noting that each node in Net-C, Net-B, and Net-A receive the update packet); storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (note that it is conventional in the art for nodes to store received addresses in their address tables); and sending a second packet from the source node to the destination node by using the new address (see page 213, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

12. Referring to claim 17, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

Art Unit: 2665

13. Referring to claim 18, Teraoka et al. disclose a distributed system with a plurality of devices, comprising: a first of the devices comprising: a source node (see Figure 2 on page 214 and note that the source node could be located on any of Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A, in addition to Net-D as shown) that sends a first packet to a destination node using an address of the destination node (see page 213, lines 19-20), that receives an update packet (Connection Notification packet, see page 214, column 1, line 3) from the destination node (see Figure 2 on page 214 - each of the hosts on Net-C, Net-B, and Net-A receive the update packet) containing a new address to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), and that sends a second packet to the destination node using the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and a second device comprising: a destination node that receives the first packet at the address and that sends the update packet containing the new address to the source node in response to the change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and see page 214, column 1, lines 1-13), and that receives the second packet (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 1 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short

Art Unit: 2665

et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

14. Referring to claim 20, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

15. Referring to claim 22, Teraoka et al. disclose a computer-readable medium containing instructions for controlling a data processing system to perform a method, the method for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein each node has an address, the method comprising the steps of: sending a first packet from the source node (see Figure 2 on page 214 and note that the source node could be located on Net-D as shown, but could also be located on Net-C, Net-B, or Net-A) to the destination node (Host-X in the example shown in Figure 2 on page 214) by using the address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 20-22); receiving an update packet (Connection Notification packet, see page 214, column 1, line 3) from the destination node containing a new address by the source node to supersede the address of the destination node responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35 and see page 214, column 1, lines 1-13); and sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36). Teraoka et al. differ from claim 22 in that they fail to disclose that the routers can be implemented as software. However, implementing routers as software is well known in the art. For example, Short et al. teach that routers can be implemented as software and/or hardware (see column 2, lines 29-30), which has the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design. One skilled in the art would have

Art Unit: 2665

recognized the advantage of being able to implement routers using software and/or hardware as taught by Short et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of software and/or hardware for routers as taught by Short et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of adding flexibility to the network design.

16. Referring to claim 24, Teraoka et al. disclose that the change in the address of the destination node to the new address is caused by a device on which the destination node runs physically changing locations (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20 and lines 24-25).

17. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Forman et al. ("The Challenges of Mobile Computing").

18. Referring to claim 3, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 1 and teach the use of central address store to manage the addresses of mobile hosts (name server, see page 210, column 2, line 35), but differ from claim 3 in that they fail to disclose a method of updating such a central address store. However, the use of central address stores for maintaining location information about mobile hosts and a method of updating them is well known in the art. For example, Forman et al. disclose the use of a central address store, the method further comprising the steps of: storing the address of the source node and the destination node in the central address store; and wherein the sending a first packet step further includes the step of: accessing the address of the destination node from the central address store; and wherein the updating step further includes the steps of: sending a third packet containing the new address of the destination node to the central address store by the destination node; and storing the new

Art Unit: 2665

address of the destination node in the central address store; and accessing the new address by the source node (see pages 8-9, "Central Services"), which has the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a central address store as taught by Forman et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of a central address store into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts.

19. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency") in view of Short et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,130,892), further in view of Francis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,331,637).

20. Referring to claim 5, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. differ from claim 5 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate using multicast and that they join multicast groups. However, multicast communication is old and well known in the art. For example, Francis et al. teach a method for routing multicast packets in a network in which the nodes communicate by using a multicast address such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to a multicast group including the source node and the destination node (see column 6, lines 28-30) and a method for a node to join a multicast group by sending a join request to a router (see column 5, lines 57-60), which has the advantage of being a more efficient means of delivering communication between a large group of users than using unicast communication. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using multicast as taught by Francis et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of multicast communication as taught

Art Unit: 2665

by Francis et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of distributing information to a large group of users more efficiently.

21. Referring to claim 12, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. differ from claim 12 in that they fail to disclose that the source node and the destination node communicate using multicast and that they join multicast groups. However, multicast communication is old and well known in the art. For example, Francis et al. teach a method for routing multicast packets in a network in which the nodes communicate by using a multicast address such that a communication sent to the multicast address is sent to a multicast group including the source node and the destination node (see column 6, lines 28-30) and a method for a node to join a multicast group by sending a join request to a router (see column 5, lines 57-60), which has the advantage of being a more efficient means of delivering communication between a large group of users than using unicast communication. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using multicast as taught by Francis et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of multicast communication as taught by Francis et al. into the invention of Teraoka et al. to achieve the advantage of distributing information to a large group of users more efficiently.

22. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

23. Referring to claim 6, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 1 but differ from claim 6 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network

Art Unit: 2665

infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

24. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Forman et al. ("The Challenges of Mobile Computing").

25. Referring to claim 10, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 8 and teach the use of central address store to manage the addresses of mobile hosts (name server, see page 210, column 2, lines 35), but differ from claim 10 in that they fail to disclose a method of updating such a central store. However, the use of central address stores for maintaining location about mobile hosts and a method of updating them is well known in the art. For example, Forman et al. disclose the use of a central address store, the method further comprising the steps of: storing an address of the source node and an address of the destination node in the central address store; and wherein the updating step further includes the step of: sending a third packet containing the new address of the destination node to the central address store by the destination node (see pages 8-9, "Central Services"), which has the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a central address store as taught by Forman et al. Therefore, it would have been obvious to

Art Unit: 2665

a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of a central address store into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of making it easier to keep track of mobile hosts.

26. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

27. Referring to claim 13, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 8 but differ from claim 13 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

28. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

29. Referring to claim 16, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 15 but differ from claim 16 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public

Art Unit: 2665

network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

30. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

31. Referring to claim 19, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 18 but differ from claim 19 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

Art Unit: 2665

32. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. ("A Network Architecture Providing Host Migration Transparency").

33. Referring to claim 21, Teraoka et al. disclose a data processing system for communicating in a network with a source node and a destination node, wherein the source node and the destination node have an address, the data processing system comprising: means for accessing an address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 19-20); means for sending a first packet by the source node (see Figure 2 on page 214 and note that the source node could be on Net-D as shown, or could be located on any of Net-A, Net-B, or Net-C) to the destination node by using the accessed address (see page 213, column 1, lines 20-22); means for receiving the first packet by the destination node at the address of the destination node (see Section 4.2 on pages 213 and 214. Note that Host-X originally receives packets at its original location in Net-A where its PN-address equals its VN-address); means for updating the accessed address responsive to a change in the address of the destination node to a new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 33-35), wherein the updating means includes: means for sending an update packet containing the new address of the destination node from the destination node to the source node (see page 214, column 1, lines 1-13), and means for storing, by the source node, the new address of the destination node, responsive to receiving the update packet (note that it is conventional in the art for nodes to store new addresses in their address tables); means for sending a second packet by the source node to the destination node by using the stored new address (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36); and means for receiving the second packet by the destination node at the new address of the destination node (see page 213, column 1, lines 35-36).

Art Unit: 2665

34. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teraoka et al. in view of Short as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of V-One Corporation ("V-One's Smartgate VPN").

35. Referring to claim 23, Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. disclose the method of claim 22 but differ from claim 23 in that they do not disclose that the network is a private network running on a public network infrastructure. However, the use of private networks over a public network infrastructure is well known in the art. For example, V-One Corporation teaches the use of VPNs, which have the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure. One skilled in the art would have recognized the advantage of using a VPN as taught by V-One Corporation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of VPNs as taught by V-One Corporation into the invention of Teraoka et al. in view of Short et al. to achieve the advantage of extending the reach of a normal network by using the public network infrastructure.

Response to Arguments

36. Applicant's arguments filed 26 January 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

37. Applicant has argued that Teraoka et al. fail to teach that the source node receives an update packet. However, Teraoka et al. clearly state on page 213, column 1, lines 33-36 that the host replies to the sender and that the sender learns the new address from the reply. Another way that an update packet could be sent from the destination to the source in Teraoka et al., using the Connection Notification packet taught by Teraoka et al. in Section 4.2 on pages 213 and 214,

Art Unit: 2665

would be if, as shown in Figure 2, the source host were located in Net C (or Net B or Net A) instead of Net D. Because the Connection Notification packet travels through Net C (and Net B) on its way to Net A, the source host would receive the notification packet. Therefore, Teraoka et al. teach not one, but two different scenarios in which their invention reads on the claims.

38. Applicant has argued that Teraoka et al. fail to teach that the source node stores the new address because the sender knows the destination's virtual address but not its physical address. However, Section 4.2 Host Migration on pages 213 and 214 clearly explains that the Connection Notification packet contains the VN address, which does not change, and the PN address, which does change. Note that it is the PN address that reads on the claim limitation "address" and not the VN address. Furthermore, on page 213, column 1, lines 33-36 Teraoka et al. teach that "the sender learns the PN-address of the migrating host when it receives a reply from that host." In this instance, the reply is the update packet and the reply must contain the new PN-address of the migrating host in order for the sender to learn the PN-address from the reply, and furthermore the step of "learning" the address means that the address is stored.

Conclusion

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period


Art Unit: 2665

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J Molinari whose telephone number is (703) 305-5742. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (703) 308-6602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Michael Joseph Molinari



ALPUS H. HSU
PRIMARY EXAMINER